DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 488 EC 093 209

AUTHOR Ellis, Ronald S.
TITLE Summer Pre-Placement Program for Severely Multihandicapped Blind Children. Summer 1975. Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [75]
NOTE 33p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Childhood; Communication Skills; Early Childhood; Exceptional Child Research; *Individualized Programs; Mobility; *Multiply Handicapped; *Parent Participation; Perceptual Development; *Program Evaluation; Psychomotor Skills; *Rehabilitation Programs; *Severely Handicapped; Social Development; Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS Personal Independence

ABSTRACT

Evaluated was the Summer Pre-Placement Program for Severely Multihandicapped Blind Children, designed to provide individualized programs for improving the performance of 16 children (4-11 years old) in the following areas--communication skills, vision training, psychomotor and perceptual training, social development, ambulation, self-dependence, self-awareness, and awareness of others. Objectives of the evaluation were to determine if the performance of a majority of students improved across all items at least one scale point in the areas mentioned above, and to determine if parents were involved in the educational and emotional needs of the children and the rehabilitation methods employed. Findings showed that although the project's first objective was not met, no child decreased in terms of the areas under consideration and parents were involved in the program. (Appended are the rating scale, a sample interview schedule, responses to telephone interviews, observation report forms, and a daily schedule.) (SBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136488

EVALUATION REPORT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Function No. 09-66603

SUMMER PRE-PLACEMENT PROGRAM FOR SEVERELY MULTIHANDICAPPED BLIND CHILDREN

Summer 1975

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EC TM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Prepared by

Dr. Ronald S. Ellis

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title VI-B, Education of the Handicapped Act and performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the Summer 1975

EC093209

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	THE PROGRAM	1
	Activities of the Staff Funded by Title VI	2
II.	EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES	4
III.	FINDINGS	7
	Evaluation Objective 1	7
	Evaluation Objective 2	10
IV.	SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	13
Appendix		
A.	The Rating Scale	16
B.	Sample Interview Schedule	18
C.	Responses to Telephone Interviews	19
D.	Observation Report Form(s)	21
E.	Daily Schedule	27

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Results of the Administration of the Locally Developed Rating Scale	8

Chapter I: THE PROGRAM

The Summer Pre-Placement Program for Severely Multihandicapped Blind Children served 16 children who were born between July 1964 and June 1971. Birth anomalies and post-natal neurological deficit characterize the children. The severe handicaps encountered by this group included: blindness, muscle dysfunction, severe hearing loss, apparent intellectual retardation on a primary and/or secondary basis, emotional problems. None of the children was able, as of June 1975, to attend an educational facility other than this one, which was designed especially for them. The inability to attend an educational facility other than this one and attendance in the facility prior to the summer of 1975 were the criteria used for the inclusion of subjects in the program. The children selected for this program live in widely separated districts in the borough of Brooklyn.

As a result of being in the program it was believed that pupil performance would improve in the following areas: communication skills, vision training, psychomotor and perceptual training, social development, ambulation, self-dependence, self-awareness and awareness of others. Furthermore it was believed that the emotional and educational needs of the children would be more effectively met.

To accomplish these results the 16 children were divided into three groups. Each child was provided with an individual program that was designed in terms of his handicap and developmental level. The programs of students were constantly reformulated as the need arose.

Within the total program Title VI funds were used specifically

fo one (the program funded only one) of the two physical therapists, three para rofe.sionels (there were four paraprofessionals in the program), and for the three teachers. The specific activities engaged in by these persons will now be described.

Activities of the Staff Funded by Title VI

Project coordinator. Implemented program; wrote proposal, processed payrolls; ordered supplies; contracted transportation; observed program; kept all data for the Bureau for the Education of the Visually Handicapped.

The physical therapists (2). Constantly using diagnostic and rehabilitative procedures, these professionals help the youngsters with their motor development. Where needed, massages are used to encourage the development of muscle tone. In some instances crawling is stressed, while in others the youngsters have been able to achieve erect standing and walking either assisted or unassisted. Motor activities in those instances where the youngsters are capable include the use of a walking bar, a tricycle, a trampoline, mats, and stair climbing.

The teachers (3). Primarily working with children in their charge in the development of early childhood skills the teachers diligently performed the tasks associated with their roles. The speech teacher engaged the pupils in activities using musical instruments and an auditory trainer so that the child could learn to equate the sound he hears with the sound he makes. Another teacher worked to develop pre-academic skills such as coloring, number concept, block building, cutting, matching, pupil interactions and constructive play. Through verbal and nonverbal methods communication skills were emphasized with new and continued emphasis on gestural communications.

Outdoor activities centered around the use of the large playground equipment on the roof of the Industrial Home for the Blind. Special water therapy at a nearby Board of Education high school swimming pool was arranged for once per week. However, that activity was terminated because of the drowning of a child in a similar program elsewhere in the city early in the summer.

The paraprofessionals (3). The paraprofessionals are directly involved with toileting. They assist the rehabilitation and classroom teachers in the development of early childhood skills such as the discrimination of color, size or shape; or the development of language and speech. They stress the development of social interaction patterns between themselves and the youngsters.

All members of the staff assist in feeding.

Attempts were made to involve parents by inviting them to observe their children frequently at the facility. These parents would then be able to provide in the home a continuation and reinforcement of the structured training that the child received in the facility.

The population of 16 children was transported by contracted mini-buses from their homes in Brooklyn to the Industrial Home for the Blind in Brooklyn from July 7, 1975 to August 7, 1975. The school day was 9:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. Each child was expected to participate at least 25 hours per week either individually or in a group. (See Appendix E.)

Chapter II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

On-site visits were made by the project evaluator and interviews were held on site with the teacher in charge, other professional staff, the physical therapists, and the paraprofessionals. In addition, conferences were held with central headquarters supervisory personnel, including the project coordinator.

To determine the effectiveness with which the evaluation objectives were attained with the total population of 16, the evaluator observed the program in operation on two separate occasions (July 1[illegible], 1975 and July 25, 1975). Observation reports are appended (see Appendix D).

The objectives of the evaluation are:

Evaluation Objective 1: To determine if the performance of a majority of pupils improves across all items at least one scale point in the areas of communication skills, vision training, psychomotor and perceptual training, social development, ambulation, self-dependence, self-awareness and awareness of others as measured by the pre-post administration of a locally developed rat[illegible]ng scale.

Evaluation Objective 2: To determine if parents are involved through observation and consultation in the educational and emotional needs of the children and the rehabilitation methods employed.

For the determination of evaluation objective 1 a rating scale was employed (see Appendix A). The scale measures children's communication skills, vision training, psychomotor and perceptual training, social development, ambulation, self dependence, self-awareness and

awareness of others. The scale was developed by the program staff. The rating scale was validated by the staff with respect to the tasks observed and used as indicators by the scale. The scale was administered during the first week of the program as a pretest and was readministered during the final week of the program as a posttest.

For the determination of evaluation objective 2 records were kept of the number of visits and the nature and duration of the observations and consultation that parents were involved in during their visits. In addition, the evaluator while observing the program, observed the nature of parent visitations. The evaluator also interviewed parents as to the frequency, character and value of their visitations (i.e., what and how much they felt that they learned). (See Appendix B.) The required records were maintained throughout the program up until its closing date.

For evaluation objective 1 the pre- and posttest scale rating for each respective child on each skill category measured will be compared. If it is found that the performance of the majority of pupils improves across all items at least one scale point, the evaluation objective will be held to have been obtained.

For evaluation objective 2 the evaluator utilized the data collected concerning the number and nature of visits, observations, consultations with staff and so forth. The data were used to assess the extent to which parents were involved through observation and consultation in developing skills for meeting the educational and

emotional needs of the children. The data were further utilized to determine if parents were learning about rehabilitation methods employed in the program and to determine whether or not the evaluation objective 2 was satisfactorily attained.

Although the evaluation design specifies that 18 children would participate in the project only 16 subjects were involved by the time that the project got underway. One of the children dropped out of the program before the pretest was administered for evaluation objective 1. The other child failed to register and did not appear at all on the records of the program.

Chapter III: FINDINGS

Evaluation Objective 1

To determine if the performance of a majority of pupils improves across all items at least one scale point in the areas of communication skills, vision training, psychomotor and perceptual training, social development, ambulation, self-dependence, self-awareness and awareness of others as measured by the pre-post administration of a locally developed rating scale.

The performance of the majority of pupils did not improve across all items at least one scale point. The evaluation objective 1 cannot therefore be held to have been attained. Table 1 shows the results of the pre-post administration of the locally developed rating scale. The mean of the differences between pre- and posttest administration across categories and subjects indicates failure to improve by at least one scale point. Examination of the data provided by the rating scale yields in addition the following results:

Self Help Skills: As of August 8, 1975, all 16 pupils attending the program showed no loss of self help skill as a result of participation in the program. One pupil seemed to demonstrate some improvement from minimum to moderate ability to function in this area.

Pre-Academic Skills: At the end of the program no change of pre-academic skill resulted as a result of participation in the program. Almost one-third of the group is non-functioning. An additional one-half of the group have a minimum ability to function in this area. Only 19 percent (three pupils) function above that level.

Table 1

Results of the Administration of the Locally Developed Rating Scale (N = 16)

Subject No.	Self Help Skills			Pre-Academic Skills			Self Awareness			Social Awareness			Ambulation			Feeding Skills			Gestural Language			Mean Difference in Scale Points of Subjects
	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	
1	1-2	1-2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	0.14
2	3	3	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	4	1	3	3	0	3	3	0	0.14
3	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	3	4	1	2-3	3	0-1	2	2-3	0-1	0.14-0.43
4	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0
5	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	2	1	1	1-2	0-1	2	3	1	1	1-2	0-1	0.28-0.57
6	1	1	0	1-2	1-2	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	3	1	2	2	0	1	4	3	0.57
7	4	4	0	3	3	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	3	4	1	0.14
8	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	0.28
9	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	3	3-4	0-1	0-0.14
10	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	3	3	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
11	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	1-2	2	0-1	2	2	0	0-0.14
12	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
13	2	2	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	2	2-3	0-1	0-0.14
14	2	2-3	0-1	2	2	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	4	1	2	2-3	0-1	2	2	0	0.14-0.43
15	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2-3	3	0-1	2	2	0	2	3	1	0.14-0.28
16	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	0
Mean difference in scale points of subjects	0-0.06			0			0			0.19			0.31-0.44			0.06-0.25			0.31-0.56			

Note. See Appendix A for explanation of scale values. The mean differences for the rows or columns in this table represent the average scale point value difference for that row or column.

Self Awareness: The staff was able to assist pupils to maintain their skill levels within this category. Even though only 12-1/2 percent were non-functioning and 12-1/2 percent possessed advanced ability to function with respect to self-awareness, three-fourths of the group possessed either minimum or moderate ability to function. The evaluation scale indicates no changes in the ratings made on the children on a pretest-posttest basis.

Social Awareness: In this category, skill levels were maintained. In addition, three pupils improved to a minimum ability to function from a non-functioning level. At the end of the summer program, over 60 percent of the pupils (10) functioned at least with minimum ability. Only two pupils were non-functioning with respect to social awareness.

Ambulation. No loss of skill in ambulation occurred as a result of the summer program. Approximately 44 percent (7) of the pupils demonstrated improvement in the ability to get around. At the end of the summer program, approximately 38 percent (6) of the pupils demonstrated an advanced ability to function in the category of ambulation.

Feeding Skills. The program staff was able to maintain the pupils' skill levels in self-feeding skills. Over 60 percent of the pupils functioned with minimum to moderate ability to feed themselves at the end of the summer program. Only three pupils remained non-functioning in their ability to feed themselves. These three students were either non-functioning or functioning at minimum ability levels

in all of the other categories.

Communication Skills: There are two categories under which communication skills were considered: Gestural language and Verbal language. Our attention shall be focused upon the former since all (except one) students were non-functional with respect to verbal language. In the Gestural Language category, skill levels were all maintained. Six of the 16 students showed some improvement.

Evaluation Objective 2

To determine if parents were involved through observation and consultation in the educational and emotional needs of the children and the rehabilitation methods employed.

Data indicate that evaluation objective 2 was attained. Communication with parents was good. Seventy-five percent of the parents visited the summer program at least once. Nine of the 16 parents (or more than 50 percent) visited during a special "Open House" which was held on July 29, 1975. Three parents visited the site at other times during the summer. All parents were contacted. Of the four parents who did not visit the site, three were communicated with via telephone. Communication was maintained with the fourth parent via notes.

Four of the 16 parents (25 percent) were randomly selected for telephone interview regarding the number and nature of visits, observations, consultation with staff and so forth (see Appendix C). The results of these interviews indicate that all of the parents contacted in this manner visited the site of the program at least

once. Three of the four parents interviewed stated that concern about their child's progress was a reason for visiting the program. Two of the four parents spoke with both the teachers and one of the therapists. All of the parents interviewed at least spoke with the teacher. The parents interviewed all felt that they learned more about what the program was attempting to do with the children.

All parents felt that the visit(s) was (were) worthwhile. However, only one parent expressed "the carryover of activities in the program into the home" as a reason for feeling that the visits were worthwhile. This statement was provided by the parent who made the largest number of visits to the program site of those interviewed during the summer period.

In general, the parents felt that the staff was cooperative and approved of all that they were doing. One parent did however see the program as somewhat limited and the curriculum as not sufficiently intensified to deal effectively with the multiply handicapped. It is important to note here that this is the same parent who stated follow-through in the home as the reason for feeling that the visits were worthwhile.

The facilities used in the project were adequate. Children had ample space and both staff and children had adequate materials and equipment with which to work.

The program as implemented coincides with the program described in the proposal. The activities of the staff demonstrate active commitment to the accomplishment of program goals and objectives.

There was on both occasions that the evaluator observed the program a full complement of staff engaged in individual as well as group instruction in discrimination of color, shape, size, gross and fine motor coordination, and self help skills such as self feeding. On the basis of what was observed by the evaluator the program appears to be servicing the needs of the children as outlined in evaluation objective 1. On the other hand, the data gathered from parents seem to indicate that additional strategies need to be employed to establish and maintain more effective two-way communication between the staff and the parents. Problems which parents face who have other children require attention for they must be overcome to enable these parents to become more involved in the program of their special child.

Recommendations made by the evaluator of the 1972-73 academic year Pre-Placement Program grew out of an indicated need for more regular use of water therapy as a strategy for the therapist. Certainly attempts have been made to carry this out since the Summer 1975 Pre-Placement program scheduled swimming for one day every week of the program.

Since this is a continuous program some of the program personnel are totally familiar with the project objectives and activities. The results of evaluations are discussed during the regular observation consultations between administration and staff involved. As a result of these discussions provisions are made for any recommendations.

Chapter IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Summer Pre-Placement Program for Severely Multihandicapped Blind Children has not met its objective of improving a majority of its children's ratings by at least one scale point on the locally developed rating scale. The program did, however, meet its second objective, since parents were involved with the program. Many parents attended more than once. Each of the parents in the 25 percent sample randomly selected for interview felt that the visits to the site of the program were worthwhile and that they learned something of what was being done in the program with their child.

This evaluator concludes that even though only one of the evaluation objectives has been obtained that the program has certainly been worthwhile. The program enabled each of 16 children to obtain intensive therapy daily throughout the duration of the summer program. From July 7, 1975 to August 7, 1975 the children were able to obtain the attention which, in some cases, it was not possible for them to obtain in their homes because of sibling demands upon their parents. The children were able to get out on trips to the extent that may not have been possible under normal circumstances at home.

It is important to note here that no child decreased in terms of the areas under consideration for evaluation objective 1. Table 1 shows that the average change (i.e., mean difference) for any one subject or for any one category included on the chart was never as great as 1.0 score points but always remained positive (i.e., was never less than zero scale points). This may mean that the Summer Pre-Placement

Program has served another important function of preventing children from losing whatever gains may have been made throughout the school year.

In addition to the specific recommendations to follow, this evaluator recommends that the program be continued and that evaluation objective 1 be modified so that the majority of the children's performance in the areas indicated on the rating scale be expected to remain the same rather than increase by one scale point. The summer period is too short a period to expect overall increase in performance.

The program may be improved if more communication is established between the teachers and therapists and the paraprofessionals. Perhaps additional time ought to be included in the program for the purpose of developing instructional strategies concurrently so that all levels of staff are clear on their roles in the program on an overall and daily basis. (See observation report for July 18, 1975 in Appendix D.)

Although parent participation was good, it could probably be improved if some provisions can be made to alleviate some of the problems which parents must solve in order to increase their levels of participation in the program. It may be possible to arrange baby sitting for siblings of children in the program. Perhaps stipends and/or transfer service for parents and siblings of program participants from home to program location may be helpful.

This evaluator further recommends that formal participation in learning experiences which would be devised by the staff for the

parents, be somehow linked with the child's attendance in the program. Moreover, it is recommended that parents be directed and guided towards ways that they may identify for the staff, areas about which they wish to learn more. It is also recommended that parents be given the responsibility for communicating these needs to the staff.

It is recommended that swimming be increased to more than once per week. It may be possible, upon resubmitting the grant proposal, to shift budget requests so that funds may be allocated for a licensed swimming teacher. A swimming teacher can be justified on the basis of the effects of swimming upon the children which were demonstrated this summer. The staff states that children seem somewhat more alert subsequent to water therapy.

Finally, stronger dishes and utensils should be used to avoid spillage during meals due to pupils' poor muscle control coupled with the use of easily crushed paper and plastic utensils for meals.

Appendix A: THE RATING SCALE

Following the text below is a sample of the scale used for the evaluation of children at the Pre-Placement Program. Both pretest and posttest data were collected on the form shown. The scale values used ranged from 1 to 5. The levels of performance represented by the scale values used are given below.

Scale Value	Level of Performance
1	Non-functioning
2	Minimum ability to function
3	Moderate ability to function
4	Advanced ability to function
5	Ability to function at age level

The sample scale shown below was administered as a pretest on July 18, 1975 and again as a posttest on August 8, 1975.

Sample of Rating Scale for Evaluation of Children of the Pre-Placement Program

	Self Help Skills			Academic Skills			Self Awareness			Ambulation			Feeding Skills			Gestural Language		
Name of Child	Pre	Post		Pre	Post		Pre	Post		Pre	Post		Pre	Post		Pre	Post	
John Doe	1	2	1	2	2	0	2	4	2	3	2	-1	1	1	0	2	2	0
Mary Doe	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	0	1	2	1	3	4	1

Pretest date: July 18, 1975 Posttest date: August 8, 1975

Appendix B: SAMPLE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The interview schedule shown below is a sample of the instrument used to interview parents via telephone concerning the frequency, character and value of their visitations.

Name of Parent_____

Name of Child_____

1. Did you visit the Industrial Home for the Blind during the time that your child was enrolled in the Summer Pre-Placement Program?
   _____Yes _____No
2. How many times did you visit?_____
3. What was (were) the reason(s) for your visit(s)?
   _____
   _____
   _____
4. With whom (i.e., teacher, therapist, aide) did you talk on your visit(s)?
   _____
   _____
5. What do you feel you learned on the visit(s)?
   _____
   _____
   _____
6. Do you feel the visit(s) was (were) worthwhile for you and/or your child? _____ Please explain.
   _____
   _____
   _____
7. Is there anything about the summer program which we have not discussed that you wish to comment upon?
   _____
   _____
   _____

Appendix C: RESPONSES TO TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

1. Did you visit the Industrial Home for the Blind during the time that your child was enrolled in the Summer Pre-Placement Program?

   Subject No. 9: Yes

   Subject No. 16: Yes

   Subject No. 1: Yes

   Subject No. 6: Yes

2. How many times did you visit?

   Subject No. 9: 6

   Subject No. 16: 5

   Subject No. 1: 1 or 2

   Subject No. 6: 1

3. What was (were) the reason(s) for your visit(s)?

   Subject No. 9: I know the teacher in charge. I went to visit my son and to talk to the staff and observe my son in the program--to be taught how to work with him at home.

   Subject No. 16: I was concerned and wanted to see how no. 16 was getting on in the program.

   Subject No. 1: I tried to continue the policy during the year of attending once per week into the summer. I did not receive letter about the Open House.

   Subject No. 6: There was an end of term party.

4. With whom (i.e., teacher, therapist, aide) did you talk on your visit(s)?

   Subject No. 9: I talked with his teachers and with the speech therapist.

   Subject No. 16: Teacher, therapist.

   Subject No. 1: I only spoke with the teacher.

   Subject No. 6: I spoke to the teacher in charge.

5. What do you feel you learned on the visit(s)?

Subject No. 9: I learned that the program conditioned him, taught him sign languages and gave him exercises for walking. I learned about the trips he took and the effects of water therapy.

Subject No. 16: I learned that no. 16 was doing well. I also learned what was being done with her in the program.

Subject No. 1: I learned that the therapists worked a great deal with no. 1 continuing his training of self feeding skills and using equipment to help walking.

Subject No. 6: I learned what they did, where he went on his trips and how he was being helped. I also learned about the progress with toilet training.

6. Do you feel the visit(s) was (were) worthwhile for you and/or your child? Please explain.

Subject No. 9: Yes. Once the parent establishes communication with the teacher she can know how to follow up at home what was done in the program.

Subject No. 16: Yes. Because of what I learned.

Subject No. 1: Yes. Because of what I learned. I regret not being able to visit more often.

Subject No. 6: Yes. It provided me with knowledge about the fun that the children had during the summer.

7. Is there anything about the summer program which we have not discussed that you wish to comment upon?

Subject No. 9: The program is limited and the curriculum is not sufficiently intensified to deal effectively with the multiple handicapped. No. 9, legally blind, is also a deaf mute with some brain damage.

Subject No. 16: The staff was very cooperative. I liked all that they were doing. I thought that the program--I have another child who requires attention (normal). I approve.

Subject No. 1: None (see answer to question 6).

Subject No. 6: These children rarely get out and the trips and the "fun" was good for no. 6. No additional comments.

Appendix D: OBSERVATION REPORT FORM(S)

Consultant's Name: Dr. Ronald Ellis

Date: July 18, 1975 Location: IHB

Project Title:

Summer Pre-Placement Program for Severely Multihandicapped, Blind Children

Time: From 10 A.M. to 2 P.M.

Name of Teacher in Charge: Mrs. Geraldine Kelly

Please make a detailed report for each category indicated. Use additional paper on the reverse side to insure complete reporting.

Theme of lesson or activity observed:

There was no lesson. Each child was worked with individually for a short period of time. Instruction was begun at the point where it was terminated at the last encounter.

Cognitive response of pupils:

Children persisted at tasks given them to the extent that their short attention spans enabled them.

Affective response of pupils:

Children seemed to be relatively calm and contented with their environment. None of the children were crying or seemed agitated.

Method of instruction used:

Individualized instruction was used. Children were instructed on a one to one basis by either the teacher, the therapist or the paraprofessional.

Description of materials used by staff:

There were many materials in use for the development of fine and gross motor coordination. Some children were able to get and return the materials used in some activities.

Description of materials used by pupils:

Physical therapist worked with specially designed steps and slide board to assist child with walking. Paraprofessionals used donut shaped objects, a peg and a lamp to assist child in identifying the circle by putting it on the peg.

Number and description of staff at site:

Two physical therapists, three teachers, four paraprofessionals

Describe activity of staff observed as indicated above:

All staff seemed actively committed to the specific duties their role required. Physical therapist used techniques designed to help one child to achieve erect standing.

Number of children in attendance: 15

Is the program operational?

Yes. One child absent due to illness.

To what extent has the program been implemented according to design?

All staff attempted to work individually with pupils in such activities as discrimination of color, size and shape.

Identify strengths:

All staff were extremely supportive of the children. All personnel assisted with feeding.

Identify weaknesses:

Paraprofessionals who worked with children sometimes functioned in a manner not consistent with procedures and strategies employed by professional staff.

Recommendations:

There should be more communication between professional and paraprofessional staff to insure consistent instructional strategies.

Consultant's name: Dr. Ronald Ellis

Date: July 25 1975 Location: IHB

Project Title:

Summer Pre-Placement Program for Severely Multihandicapped, Blind Children

Time: From 10 A.M. to 2 P.M.

Name of teacher in charge: Mrs. Geraldine Kelly

Please make a detailed report for each category indicated. Use additional paper on the reverse side to insure complete reporting.

Theme of lesson or activity observed:

Musical sounds were being made by children and by speech teacher. The purpose was to get the children to equate what they hear with what they produce.

Cognitive response of pupils:

For children who wore hearing aids or had some hearing the response was good. Their behavior indicated that they were aware of the sounds. The response of these children who were deaf was not as quick.

Affective response of pupils:

The children all enjoyed the activity. Many children smiled and clapped their hands. Other children repeated the activity on their own long after the activity had ceased. Some children put their ear to the table and banged their fingers or hand on the table to hear the sound.

Method of instruction used:

The activity observed was a group activity. However, the paraprofessionals followed up the activity by making sounds near the children's ears when they had the opportunity to relate to the children on an individual basis.

Description of materials used by staff:

The speech teacher used a wide array of musical instruments particularly percussion instruments such as tambourines, bells and drums. The paraprofessionals later used less of a variety. The evaluator observed tambourines and drums being used by paraprofessionals.

Description of materials used by pupils:

The children used tambourines after the activity was ended. During the activity, however, they used all of the available musical instruments.

Number and description of staff at site:

Two physical therapists, three teachers, four paraprofessionals.

Description of staff observed as indicated above:

All staff were extremely committed to the specific duties their role required. All staff assisted in feeding. Physical therapists continued to remove children individually from their group activities for their session with them. Teachers worked with individuals within groups while the paraprofessionals maintained the group activity.

Number of children in attendance: 16

Is the program operational? Yes

To what extent has the program been implemented according to design?

All staff seemed to work actively toward carrying out program objectives.

Identify strengths:

Children receive intensive instruction. The morale of the children as well as the staff is extremely high.

Identify weaknesses:

During lunch, some children had problems in handling the paper cups. Some spilling occurred due to children's lack of control. Water therapy was used only once per week.

Recommendations:

There should be stronger utensils used during feeding time to avoid mishaps due to the lack of control which some of the children have over their muscles. The frequency of water therapy should be increased since it appears to be beneficial.

Appendix E: DAILY SCHEDULE

9:00	Arrival of busses
9:05- 9:15	Toileting
9:15- 9:30	Snack (juice and cookies)
9:30-10:00	Physical therapy (Groups A and B) Individual work (Group C)
10:00-10:30	Physical therapy (Group C) Individual work (Groups A and B)
10:30-11:15	Outdoor activities (clear weather) Pre-academic skills (rainy days) Wednesday--water therapy
11:15-11:30	Toileting--wash up for lunch
11:30-12:00	Lunch
12:00-12:45	Rest
12:45- 1:00	Toileting
1:00- 1:45	Music--directed group activity
1:45- 2:00	Prepare for dismissal
2:00	Departure of busses